

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

CARRUM TECHNOLOGIES LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

FCA US LLC,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:21-mc-51620

HONORABLE STEPHEN J. MURPHY, III

\_\_\_\_\_/

**ORDER GRANTING  
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION TO COMPEL UNDER SEAL [1]**

Plaintiff Carrum Technologies moved unopposed for leave to file a motion to compel under seal. ECF 1. Plaintiff filed a redacted version of the motion and exhibits it sought to seal. ECF 1-3. Plaintiff also claimed its redactions are narrowly tailored and serve the compelling purpose of protecting non-public, proprietary information. ECF 1, PgID 15–16.

The Sixth Circuit favors a "strong presumption in favor of open[]" court records. *Shane Grp., Inc. v. Blue Cross Blue Shield of Mich.*, 825 F.3d 299, 305 (6th Cir. 2016) (internal quotation omitted). To overcome the strong presumption, a party must show "a compelling reason" that is "narrowly tailored to serve that reason." *Id.* (citation omitted). The Court also has an "independent" "obligation to explain the basis for sealing court records." *Id.* at 306.

The Court will grant the motion to seal because, based on the Court's independent review, the redactions in the motion are necessary and narrowly

tailored. *See id.* at 305–06 (explaining the standard for filing documents under seal). Protecting proprietary information that is not of public interest—like the information in the present motion—is a compelling reason to seal information. *See Jackson v. Gen. Elec. Aviation*, No. 1:19-cv-629, 2020 WL 5290535, at \*3 (S.D. Ohio Sept. 4, 2020) (“[T]he information the parties seek to seal is not a matter of public concern.”). Because the redactions in the motion allow the public to see all but a few words in the Plaintiff’s brief and a few exhibits, the public can easily consider the merits of Plaintiff’s motion. On that basis, the redactions are narrowly tailored, and the Court will grant the motion to seal. The Court appreciates the Plaintiff’s effort in preparing and submitting the redactions.

**WHEREFORE**, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the motion for leave to file motion to compel under seal [1] is **GRANTED**.

**SO ORDERED.**

s/ Stephen J. Murphy, III  
STEPHEN J. MURPHY, III  
United States District Judge

Dated: December 28, 2021

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties and/or counsel of record on December 28, 2021, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

s/ David P. Parker  
Case Manager